



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,520	10/31/2003	Jonathan D. Herbach	07844-622001	4224
21876 7590 11/16/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. Box 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER COLIN, CARL G	
			ART UNIT 2136	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,520

Applicant(s)

HERBACH ET AL.

Examiner

Carl Colin

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-10,12-22,24-41 and 47-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,6-10,12-22,24-41 and 47-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>see att.</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. In response to communications filed on 9/4/2007, applicant amends claims 2, 24, and 39; the following claims 2, 3, 6-10, 12-22, 24-41, and 47-56 are presented for examination.

1.1 In response to communications filed on 9/4/2007, applicant's arguments regarding the double patenting rejection of claims 48-50 has been considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's attempt to show the parallel between the claims of the present application and the copending application by using only claim 52 is in error because the rejection is pertained to all the claims of the copending application. Examiner shows an exemplary analysis with claims 52 and 54 as mentioned in the rejection and claim 54 recites "wherein the server comprises a permissions-broker server operable to identify information associated with the second document in response to the request, the associated information being retained at the server and indicating a third electronic document different from and associated with the second document, the server being operable to relate information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken". Applicant adds that the underlined portions on page 17 of the remarks of the copending application need to be addressed. Examiner respectfully disagrees because if the application to be examined has broader claims than those that are present in the copending application and all the claim limitations are disclosed in the copending application, *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Art Unit: 2136

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969), the claims can be rejected by obviousness double patenting rejection.

Applicant argues that the revocation list is to advise the user of the newer document not to force the previously requested action with respect to the newer document. Examiner respectfully disagrees because since the associated document-permissions information along with the revocation list indicate a newer document, the server is operable to relate the information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken to the newer document instead as claim 54 suggests. Therefore, the double patenting rejection remains.

1.2 Applicant's arguments, filed on 9/4/2007, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-56 have been fully considered, but they are not fully persuasive. With respect to claim 2, applicant argues that Larose fails to teach the subject matter as claimed because the receiving and identifying operations all occur at the client computer. Applicant adds "Larose does describe contacting a server, but this is done with respect to the "decisions about making the next levels available", The fact that a next level/version of the software exists is already known at the client computer, and the determination that this next level/version of the software can be installed because the relevant attribute(s) have been identified on the computer has already been performed at the client computer, when the server is contacted in Larose". Examiner respectfully disagrees because the office action clearly states, "Larose discloses identifying the associated information (user identification and version of the document) comprises identifying associated information retained at the server (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 6, paragraph 84)." It is noted that Examiner did not interpret identifying information as attributes as argued by applicant.

Art Unit: 2136

Also, regarding applicant's arguments that the next level/version exists in the client computer, as Examiner indicated during the interview, Larose clearly states, (paragraph 102) "Those persons of ordinary skill in the art will also recognize it is not essential that executable files corresponding to all of the versions of the software be loaded and installed at once." And paragraph 103, lines 1-2) added, "Optionally, only the executable file for the first version 310 need be loaded and installed." Therefore, applicant has not overcome the rejection of claim 2. Independent claims 24 and 39 have not overcome the rejection for the same reason with respect to claim 2. Applicant's arguments regarding independent claims 16 and 31 are not persuasive for the same reason given above with respect to claim 2. Applicant states "nothing in Larose suggests contacting a document control server" (page 22, last paragraph) whereas in arguing claim 2, applicant states "Larose does describe contacting a server" (page 20, last paragraph). Applicant's arguments regarding the dependent claims are not persuasive wherein Applicant generally alleges that the dependent claims are not disclosed by the prior art without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Additional clarification is provided by the Examiner in the rejection where necessary. Therefore, applicant has not overcome the rejection of the dependent claims. New claims 47-56 recite the same limitations as previously claimed in claims 7-10 and 13-15.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/4/2007 is being considered by the examiner and initialed.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.1 Claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-22, 24-41, and 47-56 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-57 of copending Application No. 10/699,124. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all the limitations of independent claims 2, 24, 39, and 45 of the present application are found in claims 52 and 54 of the copending application 10/699,124 except for the underlined portion: to force the action to be taken "with respect to the second electronic document". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2136

in the art at the time the invention was made to force the action to be taken with respect to the third electronic document rather than the second electronic document as it is disclosed in claim 32 that document permissions information may comprise policy such as document revocation list. Since the associated document-permissions information along with the revocation list indicate a newer document, the server is operable to relate the information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken to the newer document instead as claim 54 suggests. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to do so because if the second electronic document were revoked it would have made sense to force action to the third document, which is a different and associated document with the second document; and as suggested in claim 54, the server is operable to relate the information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken.

Independent claims 16 and 31 recite “opening a locally retained distributed document; contacting a document control server identified from the distributed document and forcing use of a second document in place of the distributed document with respect to at least one document action based on information received from the document control server”, and claims 42 and 54 of the copending application disclose accessing a locally electronic document at the client with respect to at least one document action based on information received from the document control server. Claim 19 of the copending application further discloses that the address of the control server may be incorporated into the document. The element that is not disclosed is “forcing use of a second document in place of the distributed document”. As mentioned above, with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1 of the present application, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2136

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to force the action to be taken with respect to the third electronic document rather than the second electronic document as it is disclosed in claim 32 that document permissions information may comprise policy such as document revocation list. Since the associated document-permissions information along with the revocation list indicate a newer document, the server is operable to relate the information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken to the newer document instead as claim 54 suggests. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been lead to do so because if the second electronic document were revoked it would have made sense to force action to the third document, which is a different and associated document with the second document; and as suggested in claim 54, the server is operable to relate the information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2-3, 6-10, 12-22, 24-41, and 47-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Publication US2002/0087876 to **Larose**.

As per claim 2, **Larose** discloses a method comprising: receiving a request to take an action with respect to a distributed electronic document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3); identifying, in response to the request, information associated with the distributed electronic document, the associated information (user identification and version of the document) indicating a second electronic document (second or third version) different from the distributed electronic document (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 5, paragraph 67); and imparting information concerning the second electronic document to force the action to be taken with respect to the second electronic document (second or third version) (see page 5, paragraph 67). **Larose** discloses the limitation of wherein receiving the request comprises receiving, at a server, the request from a client to take the action with respect to the distributed electronic document (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3), wherein the distributed electronic document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) is retained locally at the client (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3), identifying the associated information comprises identifying associated information retained at the server (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 6, paragraph 84), and imparting the second document information comprises relating the second document information from the server to the client (see page 5, paragraph 67).

As per claim 3, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein relating the second document information comprises sending the second document information to the client to allow the client to obtain the second document (see page 5, paragraph 67).

As per claim 6, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein relating the second document information comprises: obtaining the second electronic document (see page 5, paragraph 66); and sending the second electronic document to the client (see page 5, paragraph 66).

As per claim 7, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second electronic document comprises a later version of the distributed electronic document, and the associated information comprises document-permissions information specifying that the action is not permitted with respect to the distributed electronic document at the client (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82, and 92, user identification, completion of e-cash transaction, success code or security token specifying that the additional game levels, increased functionality, or file read operations with respect to the first version are not permitted).

As per claim 8, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the distributed electronic document (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82; granularity can be for instance, a game level, increased functionality, enhanced engine, additional file, etc.).

As per claim 9, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the associated information comprises user-dependent association information indicating the second electronic document, and obtaining the second electronic document comprises identifying the second electronic document based on the user-dependent association information and an identified user at the client (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67).

As per claim 10, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein obtaining the second electronic document further comprises generating at least a portion of the second electronic document based on the identified user (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67). (See also paragraph 104, the URL could be user dependent)

As per claim 12, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the distributed electronic document comprises a software program, the second electronic document comprises a later version of the software program, and the action comprises running the software program (page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 13, Larose discloses the limitation of accessing the distributed electronic document at the client (see page 6, paragraph 85); identifying an address of the server and a document identifier (metadata and security attributes) in the distributed electronic document (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92);

sending the document identifier and the requested action to the server using the address (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92 and page 8, claim 2); and replacing the distributed document, at the client, with the second document (see page 8, claim 2 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 14, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein replacing the distributed document comprises performing the action with respect to the second document (see page 8, claim 2 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 15, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second document includes the address of the server and a second document identifier, (see page 6, paragraph 92, page 7, paragraph 104, and page 8, claim 2) and replacing the distributed document further comprises writing over the distributed document with the second document in a storage device (see page 6, paragraph 89 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 16, Larose discloses opening a locally retained distributed document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) (see page 6, paragraph 85); contacting a document control server identified from the distributed document (see page 6, paragraph 92); and forcing use of a second document (second or third version) in place of the distributed document, with respect to at least one document action, based on information received from the document control server (see page 5, par. 67 and paragraphs 92-95 and claim 2).

As per claim 17, Larose discloses the limitation of obtaining the second document based on the received information (token or mechanism...) (see page 5, par. 67 and page 6, par. 92).

As per claim 18, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the received information comprises the second document (see page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 19, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second document comprises a later version of the distributed document, and forcing use comprises transparently closing the distributed document and opening the second document (see page 7, paragraph 101).

As per claim 20, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein forcing use further comprises transparently overwriting the distributed document with the second document (see page 6, paragraph 89 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 21, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the received information comprises document permissions information specifying permissions relating the second document with the distributed document (see page 6, paragraph 84 and page 7, paragraph 95).

As per claim 22, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the distributed electronic document comprises a software program, the second electronic document comprises a later version of the software program, and the at least one document action comprises running the software program (page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 24, Larose discloses a software product tangibly embodied in a machine-readable medium, the software product comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising:

receiving a request to take an action with respect to a distributed electronic document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3);

identifying, in response to the request, information associated with the distributed electronic document, the associated information (user identification and version of the document)

indicating a second electronic document (second or third version) different from the distributed electronic document (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 5, paragraph 67); and

imparting information concerning the second electronic document to force the action to be taken with respect to the second electronic document (second or third version) (see page 5, paragraph 67). Larose discloses the limitation of wherein receiving the request comprises receiving, at a server, the request from a client to take the action with respect to the distributed electronic document (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3), wherein the distributed electronic document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) is retained locally at the client (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3), identifying the associated information comprises identifying associated information retained at the server (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 6, paragraph 84), and imparting the second document information comprises relating the second document information from the server to the client (see page 5, paragraph 67).

As per claim 25, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein relating the second document information comprises sending the second document information to the client to allow the client to obtain the second document (see page 5, paragraph 67).

As per claim 26, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein relating the second document information comprises: obtaining the second electronic document (see page 5, paragraph 66); and sending the second electronic document to the client (see page 5, paragraph 66).

As per claim 27, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second electronic document comprises a later version of the distributed electronic document, and the associated information comprises document-permissions information specifying that the action is not permitted with respect to the distributed electronic document at the client (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82, and 92, user identification, completion of e-cash transaction, success code or security token specifying that the additional game levels, increased functionality, or file read operations with respect to the first version are not permitted).

As per claim 28, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the associated information comprises user-dependent association information indicating the second electronic document, and obtaining the second electronic document comprises identifying the second electronic document based on the user-dependent association information and an identified user at the client (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67).

As per claim 29, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein obtaining the second electronic document further comprises generating at least a portion of the second electronic document based on the identified user (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67). (See also paragraph 104, the URL could be user dependent).

As per claim 30, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the distributed electronic document comprises a software program, the second electronic document comprises a later version of the software program, and the action comprises running the software program (page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 31, Larose discloses a software product tangibly embodied in a machine-readable medium, the software product comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatus to perform operations comprising:

opening a locally retained distributed document (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) (see page 6, paragraph 85);
contacting a document control server identified from the distributed document (see page 6, paragraph 92); and forcing use of a second document (second or third version) in place of the distributed document, with respect to at least one document action, based on information received from the document control server (see page 5, par. 67 and paragraphs 92-95 and claim 2).

As per claim 32, Larose discloses the limitation of obtaining the second document based on the received information (token or mechanism...) (see page 5, par. 67 and page 6, par. 92).

As per claim 33, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the received information comprises the second document (see page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 34, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second document comprises a later version of the distributed document, and forcing use comprises transparently closing the distributed document and opening the second document (see page 7, paragraph 101).

As per claim 35, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein forcing use further comprises transparently overwriting the distributed document with the second document (see page 6, paragraph 89).

As per claim 36, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the received information comprises document-permissions information specifying permissions relating the second document with the distributed document (see page 6, paragraph 84 and page 7, paragraph 95).

As per claim 37, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the distributed electronic document (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82; granularity can be for instance, a game level, increased functionality, enhanced engine, additional file, etc.).

As per claim 38, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the distributed electronic document comprises a software program, the second electronic document comprises a later version of the software program, and the at least one document action comprises running the software program (page 8, claim 2).

As per claim 39, Larose discloses a system comprising:
a client operable to send a request to a server when an action is to be taken with respect to a distributed electronic document local to the client (an earlier version, first or second version for instance) (see page 6, paragraph 92 and fig.3); and a server operable to receive the request, and in response to the client, the server being operable to identify information associated with the distributed electronic document, the associated information (user identification or version of the document) and indicating a second electronic document (second or third version) different from and associated with the distributed electronic document (see page 4, paragraph 54 and page 5, paragraph 67), the server being operable to relate information concerning the second electronic document to the client to force the action to be taken (see page 5, paragraph 67). (See also paragraphs 35-36).

As per claim 40, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the server comprises:
a server core with configuration and logging components (see page 6, paragraphs 84 and 92 and page 8, claim 27);
an internal services component that provides functionality across dynamically loaded

methods; and dynamically loaded external service providers, including one or more access control service providers (see page 6, paragraphs 84 and 92).

As per claim 41, Larose discloses as interpreted by the Examiner **Larose** discloses different websites associated with different servers that meets the recitation of a business logic tier comprising a cluster of document control servers, including the server (see page 5, paragraph 65 and page 7, paragraph 104); an application tier including the client comprising a viewer client (user interface) (see page 6, paragraphs 85 and 92), a securing client (see paragraph 91), and an administration client (such as binding and inspection functions) (see paragraphs 82-83); and a load balancer that routes client requests to the document control servers (see page 6, paragraph 92 and page 7 paragraph 104).

As per claim 47, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the distributed electronic document (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82; granularity can be for instance, a game level, increased functionality, enhanced engine, additional file, etc.).

As per claim 48, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the distributed electronic document (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82; granularity can be for instance, a game level, increased functionality, enhanced engine, additional file, etc.).

As per claim 49, Larose discloses the limitation of accessing the distributed electronic document at the client (see page 6, paragraph 85); identifying an address of the server and a document identifier (metadata and security attributes) in the distributed electronic document (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92); sending the document identifier and the requested action to the server using the address (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92 and page 8, claim 2); and replacing the distributed document, at the client, with the second document (see page 8, claim 2 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 50, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein replacing the distributed document comprises performing the action with respect to the second document (see page 8, claim 2 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 51, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second document includes the address of the server and a second document identifier, (see page 6, paragraph 92, page 7, paragraph 104, and page 8, claim 2) and replacing the distributed document further comprises writing over the distributed document with the second document in a storage device (see page 6, paragraph 89 and page 5, paragraph 55).

As per claim 52, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the second electronic document comprises a later version of the distributed electronic document, and the associated information comprises document-permissions information specifying that the action is not permitted with respect to the distributed electronic document at the client (see paragraphs 54, 55,

82, and 92, user identification, completion of e-cash transaction, success code or security token specifying that the additional game levels, increased functionality, or file read operations with respect to the first version are not permitted).

As per claim 53, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the distributed electronic document (see paragraphs 54, 55, 82; granularity can be for instance, a game level, increased functionality, enhanced engine, additional file, etc.).

As per claim 54, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the associated information comprises user-dependent association information indicating the second electronic document, and the server is operable to identify the second electronic document based on the user-dependent association information and an identified user at the client (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67).

As per claim 55, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the server is operable to generate at least a portion of the second electronic document based on the identified user (see page 5, paragraphs 54, 62, and 66-67). (See also paragraph 104, the URL could be user dependent).

As per claim 56, Larose discloses the limitation of wherein the client is operable to

identify an address of the server and a document identifier (metadata and security attributes) in the distributed electronic document (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92); send the document identifier and the requested action to the server using the address (see page 6, paragraphs 91-92 and page 8, claim 2); and replace the distributed document, at the client by writing over the distributed document with the second document in a storage device (see page 8, claim 2; page 6, paragraph 89, and page 5, paragraph 55).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5.1 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as the art discloses security information associated with a second document to force action with respect to the second document. (See PTO-form 892).

Art Unit: 2136

5.2 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carl Colin whose telephone number is 571-272-3862. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00-6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser G. Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C.C./

Carl Colin

Patent Examiner, AU 2136

November 12, 2007


KAMBIZ ZAND
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER